FP2877



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:

Leonard H. Bieman

Title:

SCANNING PHASE MEASURING METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR AN OBJECT AT A VISION STATION

Docket No.:

139.045USR

Filed:

July 8, 1998

Examiner:

Hoa Q. Pham

Serial No.: 09/111,978

Due Date: September 22, 2001 (Saturday)

Group Art Unit: 2877

BOX AF

Commissioner for Patents Washington, D.C. 20231

We are transmitting herewith the following attached items (as indicated with an "X"):

 \underline{X} A return postcard.

X Notice of Appeal (1 Page).

X A check in the amount of \$155.00 for the Notice of Appeal filing fee.

Please consider this a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME for sufficient number of months to enter these papers and please charge any additional required fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.

P.O. Box 2938, Minneapolis, MN 55402 (612-373-6900)

Atty: Charles A. Lemaire

Reg. No. 36,198

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: BOX AF, Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on this 4 day of September, 2001.

CHARLES A. LEMAIRE

Name

REGISTRATION #36,198

Signature

Customer Number 21186

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A. P.O. Box 2938, Minneapolis, MN 55402 (612-373-6900)

(GENERAL)

S/N 09/111,978

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:

Leonard H. Bieman

Examiner: Hoa Q. Pham

Serial No.:

09/111,978

Group Art Unit: 2877

Filed:

July 8, 1998

Docket: 139.045USR

Title:

SCANNING PHASE MEASURING METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR AN

OBJECT AT A VISION STATION

NOTICE OF APPEAL FROM THE DECISION OF THE EXAMINER TO THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Copperl -G. Starly

BOX AF

Commissioner for Patents Washington, D.C. 20231

In compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.191, Applicant hereby appeals to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences from the decision dated June 22, 2001, of the Examiner rejecting claims 30-85 of the above-identified patent application.

No extension of time is necessary to respond to the Examiner's rejection.

Our check in the amount of \$155.00 is enclosed to pay the Notice of Appeal fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(b). Please charge any required additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

10/02/2001 SDENBOB1 00000023 190743

01 FC:219

09111978

5.00 CH

155.00 OP

LEONARD H. BIEMAN

By Applicant's Attorneys,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.

P.O. Box 2938

Minneapolis, MN 55402

(612) 373-6949

Charles A. Lemaire

Reg. No. 36,198

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to BOX AF, Commissioner of Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231 on September 24, 2001 (Monday).

CHARLES A. LEMAIRE

Name

REGISTRATION #36,198

Signature



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE **United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

DATE MAILED:

APPLICATION NO. **FILING DATE** FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 45USR 09/111.978 07/08/98 BLEMAN **EXAMINER** Γ **暦141/0904** CHARLES A LEMAIRE SCHWEGMAN LUNDBERG WOESSNER & KLUTH ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 1600 TOP TOMER 121 SOUTH ADDIT STREET 2877

MINNEAPOLIS MN 55402 D. F.R. 3 Mo. - Sept. 22, 2001 F.R. 6 Mo. - Dec. 22, 2001

09/04/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Յ**Հ**႕мեմացս՝ *Ընս*երեւմ՝ Woessner & Kluth, P.A.

> SEP 0 7 2001 RECEIVED

OCT OCT	4	WEIGE 86
To the	BADEMARD	

Advisory Action

Application No. 09/111,978 Applicant(s)

Bieman

Examiner

Hoa Q. Pham

Art Unit 2877

	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
Theres rejecti allows	FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. fore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid the abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final on under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for ance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.
	THE PERIOD FOR REPLY (check only a) or b)]
a)	
b)	expires on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, OR continues to run from the mailing date of the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
ext app	tensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate tension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The propriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the illing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).
1.□	A Notice of Appeal was filled on Appellant's Brief must be filled within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2.	The proposed amendment(s) will be entered upon the timely submission of a Notice of Appeal and Appeal Brief with requisite fees.
3.🕱	The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
(a)	they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See NOTE below);
	they raise the issue of new matter. (See NOTE below);
(c)	they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d)	they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
	NOTE: The limitation "moving the object relative to both the projected pattern of light and the detector" in claims
	30 and 60 raise new issue that would require further consideration and/or search.
4. 🗆	Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
5.□	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claim(s).
6. 🗆	The a) affidavit, b) affidavit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
7. 🗆	The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
8. 💢	For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claim(s) is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):
	Claim(s) allowed: 1-29
	Claim(s) objected to:
	Claim(s) rejected: 30-85
9.□	The proposed drawing correction filed on all has the has not been approved by the Examination
اــا.10	Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s).
11.	Other: HOA Q. PHAM PRIMARY EXAMINER ART UNIT 2877